

REMARKS

In an Office Action mailed on August 13, 2004, claims 1-3, 6, 15-17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Huang; claims 1-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Taruishi; claims 1-3 and 5-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over alleged Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (herein called "AAPA"); and claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the alleged AAPA in view of Huang and in further view of Yanagawa. The §§ 102 and 103 rejections are addressed below.

§§ 102 and 103 Rejections of Claims 8-14 and 34-36:

As amended, the method of independent claim 8 includes selectively enabling the amplification of data signals in response to an edge of at least one data strobe signal. Similarly, as amended, independent claim 34 recites enabling the amplification of data signals in response to an edge of at least one data strobe signal.

Independent claims 8 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Taruishi. As amended, however, Taruishi fails to teach all limitations of independent claims 8 and 34 and thus, fails to anticipate these claims.

More specifically, the claims now recite enabling the amplification of data signals in response to an edge of at least one data strobe signal. Contrary to these claim limitations, Taruishi discloses enabling a control signal (called "DIE") in response to a write command that is communicated to the memory device. *See, for example*, Taruishi, 11:25-28 and 2:56-62. Therefore, for at least this reason, Taruishi fails to teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claims 8 and 34.

Furthermore, neither Huang nor the alleged AAPA teaches or suggest the limitations of amended claims 8 and 34. More specifically, the AAPA does not teach or suggest enabling an amplifier in response to the edge of a data strobe signal. Huang does not teach or suggest the missing claim limitations, as Huang does not even contemplate enabling its amplifiers in response to operations that occur over a memory bus that includes a data strobe signal. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the hypothetical combination of the alleged AAPA and

Huang fails to teach or suggest all limitations of independent claims 8 and 34 and thus, overcome the § 103(a) rejections.

Claims 9-14, 35 and 36 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons that are set forth above, withdrawal of the §§ 102 and 103 rejections of claims 8-14 and 34-36 is requested.

§§ 102 and 103 Rejections of Claims 21-26, 29, 30 and 40-42:

As amended, the apparatus of independent claim 21 and the computer system of independent claim 29 includes a second circuit to selectively enable amplifiers in response to an edge of at least one data strobe signal indicated by a memory bus. Likewise, independent claim 40, as amended, recites a second circuit to enable amplifiers in response to an edge of at least one data strobe signal indicated by a memory bus.

Independent claims 21, 29 and 40 overcome the § 102 rejections in view of Taruishi for at least the reason that Taruishi discloses activating its input data latch in response to the detection of a write command, not in response to an edge of a data strobe signal. Therefore, for at least this reason, Taruishi fails to anticipate either claim 21, 29 or 40.

The hypothetical combination of Huang and the alleged AAPA also fails to teach or suggest all limitations of either independent claim 21, 29 or 40. More specifically, Huang does not teach or suggest the enablement of amplifiers in response to any operation occurring over a memory bus that includes a data strobe signal, much less enabling the amplification in response to an edge of the data strobe signal. The alleged AAPA does not teach or suggest the missing claim limitations. Therefore, for at least this reason, amended independent claims 21, 29 and 40 overcome the § 103(a) rejections in view of the hypothetical combination of Huang and the alleged AAPA.

Claims 22-26, 30, 41 and 42 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons that are set forth above, withdrawal of these §§ 102 and 103 rejections of claims 21-26, 29, 30 and 40-42 is requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the §§ 102 and 103 rejections and a favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (ITL.0668US).

Date: 8/27/04

Respectfully submitted,

Fred G. Pruner, Jr., Reg. No. 40,779
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]